



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,848	11/12/2003	Graham Hughes	05-03-010	6082
45113	7590	12/22/2008		
Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER KISS, ERIC B	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/22/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/706,848  
Filing Date: November 12, 2003  
Appellant(s): HUGHES ET AL.

Matthew S. Anderson (Reg. No. 39,093)  
For Appellants

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed September 25, 2008, appealing from the Office action mailed March 21, 2008.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellants' statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellants' statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. However, upon further review, one ground of rejection is withdrawn.

**WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS**

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner: The rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,112,225	KRAFT et al.	8-2000
6,360,268	SILVA et al.	3-2002

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

**9.1 Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 11 is apparently missing the word “receive” at the beginning of line 3. As presently written, claim 11 recites in part, “. . . configured to executable code from a server . . .,” which simply makes no sense. Appellants have agreed that the word “receive” should have been added to make the language of claim 11 parallel to that of claim 4, (Brief 18), and this is how the examiner has interpreted the claim in the rejection based on prior art. (Final Rejection 4.)

**9.2 Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,112,225 (Kraft et al.) and 6,360,268 (Silva et al.).**

Regarding claim 1, *Kraft et al.* discloses:

receiving a [] request (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 9, lines 1-27);

sending executable program code, corresponding to the [] request, to a client system (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 9, lines 1-27);

receiving a response from the client system indicating that the client system will perform a [task], and indicating that the client system was not being actively used when the executable program code was sent (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 9, lines 1-27).

*Kraft et al.* discloses a task distribution process as described above, but fails to expressly disclose the distributed task being a testing task. However, in a similar task distribution process, *Silva et al.* teaches the distribution of testing tasks in order to achieve more efficient testing. *See, e.g., Silva et al.* at col. 1, lines 22-48; col. 2, line 63, through col. 3, line 17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the task distribution of *Kraft et al.* and *Silva et al.* as part of a test request distribution system in order to gain the benefits of efficient testing.

Regarding claim 2, *Kraft et al.* further discloses executable program code, corresponding to the [] request, is sent to multiple client systems (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 7, lines 29-31). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

Regarding claim 3, *Kraft et al.* further discloses retrieving a list of client system identifiers, the client system identifiers indicating client systems to which executable program code can be sent for [processing] (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 7, lines 29-41). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

Regarding claim 4, *Kraft et al.* discloses:  
receiving executable code from a server system in a client data processing system (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 9, lines 1-27);  
if the client data processing system is in an idle state when the executable code is received, then sending a response to the server system, [processing] at least a portion of the executable code, and sending [] results to the server system (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 9, lines 1-35).

*Kraft et al.* discloses a task distribution process as described above, but fails to expressly disclose the distributed task being a testing task. However, in a similar task distribution process, *Silva et al.* teaches the distribution of testing tasks in order to achieve more efficient testing. *See, e.g., Silva et al.* at col. 1, lines 22-48; col. 2, line 63, through col. 3, line 17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the task distribution of *Kraft et al.* and *Silva et al.* as part of a test request distribution system in order to gain the benefits of efficient testing.

Regarding claim 5, *Kraft et al.* further discloses if the client data processing system is not in an idle state when the executable code is received, then no response is sent to the server and no [processing] is performed (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 9, lines 36-55). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

Regarding claim 6, in addition to the teachings applied above, *Silva et al.* further teaches the testing being a coverage analysis test (*see, e.g., Silva et al.* at col. col. 1, lines 22-48). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

Regarding claim 7, *Kraft et al.* further discloses the client data processing system is in an idle state when no user is actively operating the client data processing system (*see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at col. 8, lines 47-67). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

Regarding claims 8-21, these are data processing system and computer program product claims substantially paralleling the limitations in claims 1-7. *Kraft et al.* further discloses the use of such data processing systems and computer program products in implementing the prescribed

Art Unit: 2192

methods, *see, e.g., Kraft et al.* at Figures 3 and 4, and all other limitations have been addressed as set forth above. Therefore, for reasons stated above, such claims also would have been obvious.

**(10) Response to Argument**

**10.1 The Rejection of Claims 8-14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph (Brief 16-18).**

**Claims 8-10**

As noted above, this rejection has been withdrawn, and appellants' arguments are moot.

**Claims 11-14**

As noted in appellants' brief, although appellants appeal this ground of rejection, (Brief 12), they do not dispute the rejection of claims 11-14 based on the apparent omission of the word "receive" from claim 11. (Brief 18.) Accordingly, the rejection of claims 11-14 under § 112 should be summarily sustained.

**10.2 The Rejection of Claims 1-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Brief 19-28).**

**Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17**

*A. Receiving a test request*

Appellants continue to misconstrue the rejection. (See Final Rejection at 5.) Kraft is not relied upon as teaching receiving a *test* request, but rather receiving a subtask as part of a distributed processing system. See, e.g., Kraft at col. 7, lines 9-41. Silva teaches that such distributed subtasks can be *test* requests as part of a distributed software testing system. See, e.g., Silva at col. 1, lines 22-48; col. 2, line 63, through col. 3, line 17.



*B. Sending executable code*

The system of Kraft sends executable code (executable subtasks) to the clients. See, e.g., Kraft at col. 7, lines 9-28.

*C. Receiving a response from the client system indicating that the client system will perform a test, and indicating that the client system was not being actively used when the executable program code was sent.*

The system of Kraft sends indications to the server (in the form of requesting new tasks and sending results of previous tasks) when it is otherwise not being actively used (see decision block 608 in Figure 6 (checking if the client system is idle)). Claim 1 requires that a response from the client "indicate" that the client system will perform a test, and that the client was not being actively used when the code "was sent". This does not absolutely require the indication prior to sending or during sending, but instead may be read to include the time after sending is complete. Likewise, there is no requirement that the indication be sent prior to testing, but only that the indication correspond to an eventual testing from the point of view of the server. The eventual execution of the subtask is affirmed when the client sends the results. Further, the execution results indicate that at a time after the sending of the executable code that the client was idle as this is a necessary condition for it to run the code. Additionally, the requesting of new tasks by the client of Kraft is another indication that the client will perform another task (claim 1 only requires indicating that the client will perform "a" test).

Thus, the system of Kraft meets the limitation of, *receiving a response from the client system indicating that the client system will perform a [task], and indicating that the client system was not being actively used when the executable program code was sent*, in at least two

ways: (1) the client actively requests new subtask only when it is otherwise idle (during a screensaver operation) (see Kraft at Figure 6 (blocks 608, 609, 612); col. 9, lines 1-17); and (2) the client sends results of subtasks, which indicates the capability of performing the requested task (which in fact was completed) (see Kraft at Figure 6, block 622). Again, Silva teaches that such a subtask could be a *test* as part of a distributed testing system. Silva at col. 1, lines 22-48; col. 2, line 63, through col. 3, line 17.

**Claims 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 18, 20, and 21**

*D. If the client data processing system is in an idle state when the executable code is received, then sending a response to the server system, testing at least a portion of the executable code, and sending test results to the server system.*

The operation of the Kraft system is tied to a screen saver that implements an idle time activation program. See Kraft at Figure 6. As explicitly disclosed in Kraft, the subtask computation occurs in the peripheral computers 106 during “idle” processing times. Kraft at col. 9, lines 37-38. This idle time processing includes the processing of existing subtasks, the sending of results, and the requesting of new subtasks. See, e.g., Kraft at col. 9, lines 1-35; Figure 6.

**Claims 5, 12, and 19**

*E. If the client data processing system is not in an idle state when the executable code is received, then no response is sent to the server and no testing is performed.*

As noted above, the processing of existing subtasks, the sending of results, and the requesting of new subtasks takes place during “idle” time of the peripheral computer. See, e.g.,

Art Unit: 2192

Kraft at col. 9, lines 1-35; Figure 6. When the peripheral computer is being actively used, then the screensaver of Kraft is not active and the functions of the idle time activation program are not performed (except waiting for a new idle time to occur). See, e.g., Kraft at col. 9, lines 1-17 (describing processing steps for when the peripheral computer becomes idle); lines 39-55 (describing processing steps for when the peripheral computer becomes active, i.e., ceases to be idle).

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 2192

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric B. Kiss/

Eric B. Kiss

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Conferees:

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Tuan Q. Dam

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Eddie C. Lee

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Technology Center 2100

/Eddie C. Lee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, TC 2100